

In re Application of Kunio Miyazaki et al
App. No.: 10/709217
Filed: April 22, 2004
Conf. No.: 3216

Page 3 of 3

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct the errors in formatting, noted by the Examiner. His careful review is appreciated.

The claims are submitted for reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected all claims under 35 USC 102, as being anticipated by the published application to Hatanaka. It is most respectfully submitted that this reference not only fails to anticipate the claimed structure, but also does not and can not perform the results claimed by applicant.

There is, of course, some similarity in construction and operation in that the reference and applicants provide trackless moving systems for moveable racks. However the similarity ends there. The Examiner apparently also realizes this when he states in his rejection that "The features of Claims 2-20 appears to be disclosed also." The reference does disclose an arrangement for maintaining straight line movement of each individual rack, but lacks any structure for maintaining a desired spacing between adjacent racks. This is the heart of applicants invention. Lacking a disclosure of this in the reference, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

If the Examiner can not point out how the features claimed by applicant are clearly anticipated by the reference, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time